

App. No. 10/808,635  
Amendment Dated January 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 20 are pending in the present application. The drawings and abstract are object to for various informalities. Claims 1 – 18 are objected to. Claims 1 – 20 are rejected. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 14 – 19 are amended. Claim 4 is cancelled. No new matter is added.

#### Objection to the Drawings

FIG. 5 is objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). In particular, FIG. 5 lacks a label for the term "VOUT" that is described in the specification, and also because FIG. 5 includes a reference label "500" that is properly referenced in the specification. The specification has been amended to remove the label "VOUT" in favor of label "VREF", which is already included in FIG. 5. The specification has also been amended to include the reference to label "500", which simply refers to the entire circuit schematic. It is believed that the objection to FIG. 5 is overcome by this amendment and notice to that effect is requested.

FIG. 6 is objected to for failing to have a designation of "PRIOR ART". A replacement sheet for FIG. 6 is included with this response, where the replacement sheet has the designation of "PRIOR ART." It is believed that the objection to FIG. 6 is overcome by this amendment and notice to that effect is requested.

#### Objection to the Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to for describing various merits of the invention, and for including a customer number that is not necessary. In accordance with the Examiner's request, the abstract of the disclosure has been amended to remove the last sentence, and also

App. No. 10/808,635  
Amendment Dated January 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

remove the customer number. It is believed that the objection to specification is overcome by this amendment and notice to that effect is requested.

#### **Objection to the Claims**

Claims 1 – 18 are objected to for various informalities. In particular claims 1, 14 and 15 have been objected to for various typographical errors that are now corrected by way of amendment.

#### **Rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1 – 20 are objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner noted points of confusion or errors with regard to claims 1, 2, 4, and 15 – 17.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for such a thorough review. Claim 4 is cancelled, and claims 1, 2 and 15 – 17 are amended. It is believed that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is overcome, and notice to that effect is kindly requested.

Applicant has reviewed each of the pending claims, and further amended claim 18 to properly depend from claim 14 instead of claim 12.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 4 – 5 are indicated as allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 4 has been cancelled and its limitations have been properly incorporated into now amended claim 1. Claims 2, 3 and 5 – 13 now properly depend

App. No. 10/808,635  
Amendment Dated January 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

from claim 1 and are thus also proposed to be allowable. Therefore, it is believed that claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 13 are in proper form for allowance, and notice to that effect is requested.

**Rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 – 3 and 6 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102, second paragraph as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,939,442 (the '442 patent) to Carvajal et al. Claims 1 – 13 are considered allowable for the reasons previously stated above. Claims 14 – 20 are further proposed to be allowable for the reasons stated below.

Claim 14 as amended includes at least the following limitations not disclosed, taught or otherwise suggested in the '442 patent:

“a signal combination resistor means that is coupled between the second common node and the first common node, wherein the signal combination means is arranged to adjust the temperature compensated reference signal in response to combine the first signal and the second signal at the first common node such that the output of the band-gap cell at the second common node corresponds to a temperature compensated reference signal has with a third temperature response profile that is determined by combination of the first temperature response profile and the second temperature response profile.”

The '442 patent does not teach coupling a resistor means between the second common node and the first common mode, where the resistor means is arranged to combine two signals with different temperature response profiles. Since these features, as they relate to the other structural features are not described or otherwise taught in the '442 reference, it is believe that claim 14 is allowable for at least that reason. Claims 15 – 18 depend upon and further limit claim 14, and are thus also believed to be allowable. Claims 14 – 18 are now in proper form for allowance and notice to that effect is requested.

App. No. 10/808,635  
Amendment Dated January 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

Claim 19 as amended includes at least the following limitations not disclosed, taught or otherwise suggested in the '442 patent:

“coupling a band-gap cell between a first common node and a power supply node;”

“coupling a resistor between the first common node and a second common node;”

“monitoring voltages at the second common node with a voltage divider to provide a feedback signal that is responsive to changes in the band-gap voltage;”

“coupling an output signal from the PTAT circuit to the first common node when the PTAT circuit is active such that the temperature profile associated with the band-gap voltage is modified by the PTAT circuit to create a third temperature profile that corresponds to the combined temperature profiles of the band-gap cell and the PTAT circuit.”

The '442 patent does not teach coupling a resistor between the first common node and the second common node, nor does the '442 patent teach monitoring voltages at the second common node with a voltage divider to provide the feedback signal responsive to changes in the band-gap voltage. Moreover, the other described claim elements in Applicant's amended claim 19 includes steps that require additional structural connectivity such as, for example, the band-gap cell being coupled to the resistor, which in effect couples the signals together, at two places (i.e., the second common node and the first common node). Since these features, as they relate to the other structural features are not described or otherwise taught in the '442 reference, it is believed that claim 19 is allowable for at least that reason. Claim 20 depends upon and further limit claim 19, and are thus also believed to be allowable. Claims 19 – 20 are now in proper form for allowance and notice to that effect is requested.

App. No. 10/808,635  
Amendment Dated January 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
206.342.6200  
(BAH/ab)

Brett A. Hertzberg  
Registration No. 42,660  
Direct Dial: 206.342.6255



App. No. 10/808,635  
Amendment Dated January 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 20 are pending in the present application. The drawings and abstract are object to for various informalities. Claims 1 – 18 are objected to. Claims 1 – 20 are rejected. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 14 – 19 are amended. Claim 4 is cancelled. No new matter is added.

#### Objection to the Drawings

FIG. 5 is objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). In particular, FIG. 5 lacks a label for the term "VOUT" that is described in the specification, and also because FIG. 5 includes a reference label "500" that is properly referenced in the specification. The specification has been amended to remove the label "VOUT" in favor of label "VREF", which is already included in FIG. 5. The specification has also been amended to include the reference to label "500", which simply refers to the entire circuit schematic. It is believed that the objection to FIG. 5 is overcome by this amendment and notice to that effect is requested.

FIG. 6 is objected to for failing to have a designation of "PRIOR ART". A replacement sheet for FIG. 6 is included with this response, where the replacement sheet has the designation of "PRIOR ART." It is believed that the objection to FIG. 6 is overcome by this amendment and notice to that effect is requested.

#### Objection to the Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to for describing various merits of the invention, and for including a customer number that is not necessary. In accordance with the Examiner's request, the abstract of the disclosure has been amended to remove the last sentence, and also

App. No. 10/808,635  
Amendment Dated January 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

remove the customer number. It is believed that the objection to specification is overcome by this amendment and notice to that effect is requested.

#### **Objection to the Claims**

Claims 1 – 18 are objected to for various informalities. In particular claims 1, 14 and 15 have been objected to for various typographical errors that are now corrected by way of amendment.

#### **Rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1 – 20 are objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner noted points of confusion or errors with regard to claims 1, 2, 4, and 15 – 17.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for such a thorough review. Claim 4 is cancelled, and claims 1, 2 and 15 – 17 are amended. It is believed that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is overcome, and notice to that effect is kindly requested.

Applicant has reviewed each of the pending claims, and further amended claim 18 to properly depend from claim 14 instead of claim 12.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 4 – 5 are indicated as allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 4 has been cancelled and its limitations have been properly incorporated into now amended claim 1. Claims 2, 3 and 5 – 13 now properly depend

App. No. 10/808,635  
Amendment Dated January 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

from claim 1 and are thus also proposed to be allowable. Therefore, it is believed that claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 13 are in proper form for allowance, and notice to that effect is requested.

**Rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 – 3 and 6 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102, second paragraph as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,939,442 (the '442 patent) to Carvajal et al. Claims 1 – 13 are considered allowable for the reasons previously stated above. Claims 14 – 20 are further proposed to be allowable for the reasons stated below.

Claim 14 as amended includes at least the following limitations not disclosed, taught or otherwise suggested in the '442 patent:

“a signal combination resistor means that is coupled between the second common node and the first common node, wherein the signal combination means is arranged to adjust the temperature compensated reference signal in response to combine the first signal and the second signal at the first common node such that the output of the band-gap cell at the second common node corresponds to a temperature compensated reference signal has with a third temperature response profile that is determined by combination of the first temperature response profile and the second temperature response profile.”

The '442 patent does not teach coupling a resistor means between the second common node and the first common mode, where the resistor means is arranged to combine two signals with different temperature response profiles. Since these features, as they relate to the other structural features are not described or otherwise taught in the '442 reference, it is believe that claim 14 is allowable for at least that reason. Claims 15 – 18 depend upon and further limit claim 14, and are thus also believed to be allowable. Claims 14 – 18 are now in proper form for allowance and notice to that effect is requested.



App. No. 10/808,635  
Amendment Dated January 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

Claim 19 as amended includes at least the following limitations not disclosed, taught or otherwise suggested in the '442 patent:

"coupling a band-gap cell between a first common node and a power supply node;"

"coupling a resistor between the first common node and a second common node;"

"monitoring voltages at the second common node with a voltage divider to provide a feedback signal that is responsive to changes in the band-gap voltage;"

"coupling an output signal from the PTAT circuit to the first common node when the PTAT circuit is active such that the temperature profile associated with the band-gap voltage is modified by the PTAT circuit to create a third temperature profile that corresponds to the combined temperature profiles of the band-gap cell and the PTAT circuit."

The '442 patent does not teach coupling a resistor between the first common node and the second common node, nor does the '442 patent teach monitoring voltages at the second common node with a voltage divider to provide the feedback signal responsive to changes in the band-gap voltage. Moreover, the other described claim elements in Applicant's amended claim 19 includes steps that require additional structural connectivity such as, for example, the band-gap cell being coupled to the resistor, which in effect couples the signals together, at two places (i.e., the second common node and the first common node). Since these features, as they relate to the other structural features are not described or otherwise taught in the '442 reference, it is believed that claim 19 is allowable for at least that reason. Claim 20 depends upon and further limit claim 19, and are thus also believed to be allowable. Claims 19 - 20 are now in proper form for allowance and notice to that effect is requested.

App. No. 10/808,635  
Amendment Dated January 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
206.342.6200  
(BAH/ab)

---

Brett A. Hertzberg  
Registration No. 42,660  
Direct Dial: 206.342.6255



App. No. 10/808,635  
Amendment Dated January 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 20 are pending in the present application. The drawings and abstract are objected to for various informalities. Claims 1 – 18 are objected to. Claims 1 – 20 are rejected. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 14 – 19 are amended. Claim 4 is cancelled. No new matter is added.

#### Objection to the Drawings

FIG. 5 is objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). In particular, FIG. 5 lacks a label for the term "VOUT" that is described in the specification, and also because FIG. 5 includes a reference label "500" that is properly referenced in the specification. The specification has been amended to remove the label "VOUT" in favor of label "VREF", which is already included in FIG. 5. The specification has also been amended to include the reference to label "500", which simply refers to the entire circuit schematic. It is believed that the objection to FIG. 5 is overcome by this amendment and notice to that effect is requested.

FIG. 6 is objected to for failing to have a designation of "PRIOR ART". A replacement sheet for FIG. 6 is included with this response, where the replacement sheet has the designation of "PRIOR ART." It is believed that the objection to FIG. 6 is overcome by this amendment and notice to that effect is requested.

#### Objection to the Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to for describing various merits of the invention, and for including a customer number that is not necessary. In accordance with the Examiner's request, the abstract of the disclosure has been amended to remove the last sentence, and also

App. No. 10/808,635  
Amendment Dated January 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

remove the customer number. It is believed that the objection to specification is overcome by this amendment and notice to that effect is requested.

### **Objection to the Claims**

Claims 1 – 18 are objected to for various informalities. In particular claims 1, 14 and 15 have been objected to for various typographical errors that are now corrected by way of amendment.

### **Rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1 – 20 are objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner noted points of confusion or errors with regard to claims 1, 2, 4, and 15 – 17.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for such a thorough review. Claim 4 is cancelled, and claims 1, 2 and 15 – 17 are amended. It is believed that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is overcome, and notice to that effect is kindly requested.

Applicant has reviewed each of the pending claims, and further amended claim 18 to properly depend from claim 14 instead of claim 12.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 4 – 5 are indicated as allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 4 has been cancelled and its limitations have been properly incorporated into now amended claim 1. Claims 2, 3 and 5 – 13 now properly depend

App. No. 10/808,635  
Amendment Dated January 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

from claim 1 and are thus also proposed to be allowable. Therefore, it is believed that claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 13 are in proper form for allowance, and notice to that effect is requested.

**Rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 – 3 and 6 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102, second paragraph as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,939,442 (the '442 patent) to Carvajal et al. Claims 1 – 13 are considered allowable for the reasons previously stated above. Claims 14 – 20 are further proposed to be allowable for the reasons stated below.

Claim 14 as amended includes at least the following limitations not disclosed, taught or otherwise suggested in the '442 patent:

“a signal combination resistor means that is coupled between the second common node and the first common node, wherein the signal combination means is arranged to adjust the temperature compensated reference signal in response to combine the first signal and the second signal at the first common node such that the output of the band-gap cell at the second common node corresponds to a temperature compensated reference signal has with a third temperature response profile that is determined by combination of the first temperature response profile and the second temperature response profile.”

The '442 patent does not teach coupling a resistor means between the second common node and the first common mode, where the resistor means is arranged to combine two signals with different temperature response profiles. Since these features, as they relate to the other structural features are not described or otherwise taught in the '442 reference, it is believe that claim 14 is allowable for at least that reason. Claims 15 – 18 depend upon and further limit claim 14, and are thus also believed to be allowable. Claims 14 – 18 are now in proper form for allowance and notice to that effect is requested.

App. No. 10/808,635  
Amendment Dated January 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

Claim 19 as amended includes at least the following limitations not disclosed, taught or otherwise suggested in the '442 patent:

“coupling a band-gap cell between a first common node and a power supply node;”

“coupling a resistor between the first common node and a second common node;”

“monitoring voltages at the second common node with a voltage divider to provide a feedback signal that is responsive to changes in the band-gap voltage;”

“coupling an output signal from the PTAT circuit to the first common node when the PTAT circuit is active such that the temperature profile associated with the band-gap voltage is modified by the PTAT circuit to create a third temperature profile that corresponds to the combined temperature profiles of the band-gap cell and the PTAT circuit.”

The '442 patent does not teach coupling a resistor between the first common node and the second common node, nor does the '442 patent teach monitoring voltages at the second common node with a voltage divider to provide the feedback signal responsive to changes in the band-gap voltage. Moreover, the other described claim elements in Applicant's amended claim 19 includes steps that require additional structural connectivity such as, for example, the band-gap cell being coupled to the resistor, which in effect couples the signals together, at two places (i.e., the second common node and the first common node). Since these features, as they relate to the other structural features are not described or otherwise taught in the '442 reference, it is believed that claim 19 is allowable for at least that reason. Claim 20 depends upon and further limit claim 19, and are thus also believed to be allowable. Claims 19 – 20 are now in proper form for allowance and notice to that effect is requested.

App. No. 10/808,635  
Amendment Dated January 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
206.342.6200  
(BAH/ab)

Brett A. Hertzberg  
Registration No. 42,660  
Direct Dial: 206.342.6255

